

1 Humberto M. Guizar (SBN 125769)
Kent M. Henderson (SBN 139530)
2 Angel Carrazco, Jr. (SBN 230845)
GUIZAR, HENDERSON & CARRAZCO, L.L.P.
3 18301 Irvine Boulevard
Tustin, CA 92780
4 Telephone: (714) 541-8600
Facsimile: (714) 541-8601

5 *Attorneys for Plaintiffs*

6
7 **UNITED STATES DISTRICT COURT**
8 **CENTRAL DISTRICT OF CALIFORNIA**

9 N.L.A., a minor by and through her
guardian, MARICRUZ HERRERA,
10 individually and as heir at law and
successor in interest to NOEL
11 AGUILAR, deceased; and ELVIA
AGUILAR, individually,

12 Plaintiffs,

13 vs.

14 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES;
ALBERT MURAD, an individual; JOSE
15 RUIZ, an individual, and DOES 3-10,
inclusive,

16 Defendants.
17
18
19
20
21
22

Case No.

COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES

1. Unreasonable Search and Seizure—
Detention and Arrest (42 U.S.C. §
1983)
2. Unreasonable Search and Seizure—
Excessive Force (42 U.S.C. § 1983)
3. Unreasonable Search and Seizure—
Denial of Medical Care (42 U.S.C.
§ 1983)
4. Substantive Due Process—(42
U.S.C. § 1983)
5. Municipal Liability for
Unconstitutional Custom, Practice,
or Policy—(42 U.S.C. § 1983)
6. False Arrest/ False Imprisonment
7. Battery (Wrongful Death)
8. Negligence (Wrongful Death)

DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL

23 **COMPLAINT FOR DAMAGES**

24 N.L.A, a minor, by and through their guardian, MARICRUZ HERRERA,
25 individually and as successor in interest to NOEL AGUILAR, deceased, and ELVIA
26 AGUILAR, individually, for their Complaint against Defendants COUNTY OF
27
28

1 LOS ANGELES, ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ, and DOES 3-10, inclusive,
2 allege as follows:

3 INTRODUCTION

4 1. This civil rights and state tort action seeks compensatory and punitive
5 damages from Defendants for violating various rights under the United States
6 Constitution and state law in connection with the fatal police shooting of NOEL
7 AGUILAR, the father of N.L.A., and the son of ELVIA AGUILAR
8 (“DECEDENT”), on May 26, 2014.

9 2. Defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ, and DOES 3-10
10 (“DEPUTIES”) proximately caused DECEDENT’s and Plaintiffs’ injuries by firing
11 the shots that killed DECEDENT, by integrally participating or failing to intervene
12 in the shooting, and by engaging in other acts and/ or omissions around the time of
13 the shooting that resulted in his death.

14 3. Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES (“COUNTY”), ALBERT
15 MURAD, JOSE RUIZ and DOES 3-10 also proximately caused DECEDENT’s and
16 Plaintiffs’ injuries and are liable under state law and under principles set forth in
17 *Monell v. Department of Social Services*, 436 U.S. 658 (1978).

18 4. The policies and customs behind shootings of civilians such as NOEL
19 AGUILAR are fundamentally unconstitutional and constitute a menace of major
20 proportions to the public. Accordingly, insofar as Plaintiffs herein seek by means of
21 this civil rights action to hold accountable those responsible for the killing of NOEL
22 AGUILAR and to challenge the COUNTY’s unconstitutional policies and practices,
23 this civil rights action is firmly in the public interest.

24 PARTIES

25 5. At all relevant times, decedent NOEL AGUILAR was an individual
26 residing in the County of Los Angeles, California.

27 6. Plaintiff N.L.A. is a minor individual residing in the County of Los
28 Angeles, California and is the natural born child of DECEDENT. N.L.A. sues by

1 and through her *Guardian* MARICRUZ HERRERA, both in her individual capacity
2 as the child of DECEDENT and in a representative capacity as a successor-in-
3 interest to DECEDENT pursuant to California Civil Code § 377.32. N.L.A. seeks
4 both survival and wrongful death damages under federal and state law.

5 7. Plaintiff ELVIA AGUILAR is an individual residing in the County of
6 Los Angeles, California and is the mother of DECEDENT. ELVIA AGUILAR sues
7 both in her individual capacity as the mother of DECEDENT and in a representative
8 capacity as a successor-in-interest to DECEDENT pursuant to California Civil Code
9 § 377.32. ELVIA AGUILAR seeks both survival and wrongful death damages
10 under federal and state law.

11 8. Defendants ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ, and DOES 3-8
12 (DEPUTIES) are sheriff's deputies for the Los Angeles County Sheriff's
13 Department ("LASD"). Said DEPUTIES were acting under color of law within the
14 course and scope of their duties as sheriff's deputies for the LASD. Said DEPUTIES
15 were acting with the complete authority and ratification of their principal, Defendant
16 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

17 9. Defendants DOES 9-10 are supervisory officers for the LASD who
18 were acting under color of law within the course and scope of their duties as
19 sheriff's deputies for the LASD. DOES 9-10 were acting with the complete
20 authority and ratification of their principal, Defendant COUNTY OF LOS
21 ANGELES.

22 10. Defendants DOES 9-10 are managerial, supervisory, and
23 policymaking employees of the LASD, who were acting under color of law within
24 the course and scope of their duties as managerial, supervisory, and policymaking
25 employees for the LASD. DOES 9-10 were acting with the complete authority and
26 ratification of their principal, Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES.

27 11. On information and belief, defendants ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ
28 and DOES 3-10 were residents of the County of Los Angeles.

1 12. At all relevant times, Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES is and
2 was a duly organized public entity, form unknown, existing under the laws of the
3 State of California. Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES is a chartered
4 subdivision of the State of California with the capacity to be sued. Defendant
5 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES is responsible for the actions, omissions, policies,
6 procedures, practices, and customs of its various agents and agencies, including the
7 LASD and its agents and employees. At all relevant times, Defendant COUNTY OF
8 LOS ANGELES was responsible for assuring that the actions, omissions, policies,
9 procedures, practices, and customs of the LASD and its employees and agents
10 complied with the laws of the United States and of the State of California. At all
11 relevant times, COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES was the employer of Defendants
12 ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES.

13 13. In doing the acts and failing and omitting to act as hereinafter
14 described, Defendants ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES 3-8
15 were acting on the implied and actual permission and consent of supervisory
16 Defendants DOES 9-10.

17 14. In doing the acts and failing and omitting to act as hereinafter
18 described, Defendants ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ and DOES 3-10 were acting
19 on the implied and actual permission and consent of the COUNTY OF LOS
20 ANGELES.

21 15. The true names and capacities, whether individual, corporate,
22 association or otherwise of Defendants DOES 3-10, inclusive, are unknown to
23 Plaintiffs, who otherwise sue these Defendants by such fictitious names. Plaintiffs
24 will seek leave to amend this complaint to show the true names and capacity of
25 these Defendants when they have been ascertained. Each of the fictitiously-named
26 Defendants is responsible in some manner for the conduct or liabilities alleged
27 herein.
28

1 16. At all times mentioned herein, each and every Defendant was the agent
2 of each and every other Defendant and had the legal duty to oversee and supervise
3 the hiring, conduct, and employment of each and every Defendant.

4 17. All of the acts complained of herein by Plaintiffs against Defendants
5 were done and performed by said Defendants by and through their authorized
6 agents, servants, and/or employees, all of whom at all relevant times herein were
7 acting within the course, purpose, and scope of said agency, service, and/or
8 employment capacity. Moreover, Defendants and its agents ratified all of the acts
9 complained of herein.

10 18. All Defendants who are natural persons, including defendants
11 ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ and DOES 3-10, are sued individually and/or in
12 his/her official capacity as officers, sergeants, captains, commanders, supervisors,
13 and/or civilian employees, agents, policy makers, and representatives for the LASD.

14 19. NOEL AGUILAR died as a direct and proximate result of the actions
15 of Defendants ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES. Defendants
16 ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES are directly liable for
17 Plaintiffs' injuries under federal law pursuant to 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

18 20. Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-10 are liable
19 for Plaintiffs' injuries under California law and under the doctrine of *respondeat*
20 *superior*. Liability under California law for public entities and public employees is
21 based upon California Government Code §§ 815.2, 820, and 820.8.

22 21. The Plaintiffs filed comprehensive and timely claims for damages with
23 the County of Los Angeles on November 25, 2014, pursuant to applicable sections
24 of the California Government Code.

25 22. On December 8, 2014, the County of Los Angeles denied said claims
26 by a letter rejecting said claims.

1 29. At the time that he was shot and killed on May 26, 2014, NOEL
2 AGUILAR had committed no crimes and defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE
3 RUIZ lacked probable cause to make an arrest of his person.

4 30. At the time that he was shot and killed on May 26, 2014, NOEL
5 AGUILAR presented no immediate danger to any of the deputies on the scene.

6 31. From the time that the defendants, ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ
7 and DOES 3-8 first saw NOEL AGUILAR on May 26, 2014, until they shot and
8 killed NOEL AGUILAR, minutes later, at no time during that relevant time period
9 did NOEL AGUILAR have a weapon or firearm in his hands, or any object that
10 appeared similar to a weapon or firearm.

11 32. NOEL AGUILAR died on May 26, 2014, as a direct and immediate
12 result of being shot by defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ, sustaining
13 gunshot wounds to the back of his neck, to the upper back, on the back of mid chest,
14 to his right thigh, to his left arm, to his left shoulder, as well as sustaining
15 lacerations, contusions and lacerations throughout his body.

16 33. At no time, prior to being shot and killed by defendants ALBERT
17 MURAD and JOSE RUIZ, did NOEL AGUILAR display a weapon or other
18 instrument, or take any physical action that would lead a reasonable officer to
19 believe that his or her life was in danger or in threat of eminent harm.

20 34. A weapon may have been found on NOEL AGUILAR after his death,
21 but said weapon was never displayed by NOEL AGUILAR, and the defendant
22 deputies did not see a weapon prior to shooting and killing NOEL AGUILAR.

23 35. After the shooting, the officers delayed requesting medical assistance
24 for NOEL AGUILAR.

25 36. At the time of the shooting of May 26, 2014, NOEL AGUILAR was
26 unarmed and did not have anything in his hands, other than a handcuff placed on his
27 left wrist by the defendant deputies. Noel Aguilar was a person much smaller than
28 either of the officers and presented no threat of bodily harm or death to the

1 defendant deputies, ALBERT MURAD or JOSE RUIZ, or the other deputies on the
2 scene, that would justify the use of lethal deadly force. Defendant deputies
3 ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ used excessive force in shooting and killing
4 NOEL AGUILAR on May 26, 2014, as he lay face down on the pavement.

5 37. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereupon allege, that NOEL
6 AGUILAR died after experiencing great pain and anguish, after he was thrown
7 down on the ground by defendant deputies, physically abused, then shot and killed
8 by defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ.

9 38. On May 26, 2014, at the time of being shot, or immediately prior,
10 NOEL AGUILAR was not engaged in the commission of a crime and, under the
11 United States Constitution and the cases interpreting it, had rights including a liberty
12 interest to be free in one's person from unlawful search and seizure of one's person
13 and a right to not have excessive force used against him.

14 39. When defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ engaged in the
15 pursuit of NOEL AGUILAR on May 26, 2014, they did not possess information that
16 NOEL AGUILAR was engaged in the commission of a crime, and they had no
17 reasonable suspicion of wrong doing, and there was no probable cause of the
18 commission of a crime. Defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ, while
19 acting under color of law, used excessive force in shooting and killing NOEL
20 AGUILAR.

21 40. Defendants ALBERT MUAD and JOSE RUIZ and DOES 3-10, while
22 acting within the course and scope of their employment with DEFENDANT
23 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, detained and arrested NOEL AGUILAR, which
24 was a violation of his Fourth Amendment rights to be free from unreasonable
25 searches and seizures as he had committed no crimes and there was no legal reason
26 for him to be detained.

27 41. On May 26, 2014, in the 6900 block of Long Beach Boulevard, in the
28 City of Long Beach, California, defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ,

1 while acting within the course and scope of their employment with defendant
2 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and the Los Angeles County Sheriff's Department,
3 and under color of State law, used excessive force and shot and killed NOEL
4 AGUILAR without probable cause, justification or excuse. At the time that
5 defendants MURAD and RUIZ shot and killed NOEL AGUILAR, he presented no
6 threat to the deputies' lives or the lives of others.

7 42. At the time that the two officers, ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ,
8 and the other deputies present, engaged in the pursuit of NOEL AGUILAR, he was
9 engaged in the lawful activity of riding his bicycle. Even though he ran from the
10 officers when they attempted a traffic stop, this did not justify the use of excessive
11 force in shooting and killing him within a couple of minutes from the time of the
12 initial encounter. Without warning of any sorts, and without legal justification,
13 Defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ,, without reason, cause or
14 justification, fired upon and killed NOEL AGUILAR. When NOEL AGUILAR was
15 shot and killed, he presented no threat to the defendant officers or others, and there
16 was no legal cause or excuse to seize the person or Noel Aguilar.

17 43. NOEL AGUILAR did as a direct result of being shot multiple times by
18 defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ.

19 44. Defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ, and each of them,
20 discharged his firearm recklessly, intentionally, tortuously and/or, in the alternative,
21 negligently, with the intent to kill and/or commit serious bodily injury upon Noel
22 Aguilar and to violate his civil rights.

23 45. DECEDENT Noel Aguilar sustained injuries, including but not limited
24 to pain and suffering, loss of enjoyment of life, and death when he was shot by
25 Defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ who were acting under color of law
26 and as employees of the LASD. Defendants DOES 3-10, inclusive, integrally
27 participated in or failed to intervene in the shooting.

28

1 46. The use of deadly force against DECEDENT was excessive and
2 objectively unreasonable under the circumstances, especially because at all relevant
3 times DECEDENT was unarmed and posed no threat to defendants MURAD,
4 RUIZ, or any DOE DEPUTY or any other individual.

5 47. Upon information and belief, after being shot, DECEDENT was
6 immobile, bleeding profusely, and in obvious and critical need of emergency
7 medical care and treatment. Defendants did not timely summon medical care or
8 permit medical personnel to treat DECEDENT. The delay of medical care to
9 DECEDENT caused DECEDENT extreme physical and emotional pain and
10 suffering, and was a contributing cause of DECEDENT's death.

11 48. Plaintiffs N.L.A. and Elvia Aguilar were dependent on DECEDENT,
12 including financially dependent.

13
14 **FIRST CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 **Unreasonable Search and Seizure—Detention and Arrest (42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

16 (Against Defendants MURAD, RUIZ, and DOE DEPUTIES)

17 49. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1
18 through 48 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth
19 herein.

20 50. When Defendant ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ and DOE
21 DEPUTIES shot DECEDENT and placed him in handcuffs, they violated
22 DECEDENT's right to be secure in his person against unreasonable searches and
23 seizures as guaranteed to the DECEDENT under the Fourth Amendment to the
24 United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.

25 51. As a result of their misconduct, Defendants MURAD, RUIZ, and DOE
26 DEPUTIES are liable for DECEDENT's injuries, either because they were integral
27 participants in the wrongful detention and arrest, or because they failed to intervene
28 to prevent these violations.

1 52. Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES detained
2 DECEDENT without reasonable suspicion and arrested him without probable cause.

3 53. The conduct of Defendant MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES was
4 willful, wanton, malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety
5 of DECEDENT and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive
6 damages as to Defendants DOE DEPUTIES.

7 54. Plaintiffs N.L.A. and EL VIA AGUILAR bring this claim in each case
8 as successor-in-interest to the DECEDENT, and in each case seek both survival and
9 wrongful death damages for the violation of DECEDENT's rights.

10 55. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.

11 12 **SECOND CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

13 **Unreasonable Search and Seizure—Excessive Force (42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

14 (Against Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES)

15 56. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1
16 through 55 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth
17 herein.

18 57. Defendants MURAD and RUIZ' unjustified shooting deprived
19 DECEDENT of his right to be secure in his person against unreasonable searches
20 and seizures as guaranteed to DECEDENT under the Fourth Amendment to the
21 United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.

22 58. As a result, DECEDENT suffered extreme pain and suffering and
23 eventually suffered a loss of life and of earning capacity. Plaintiffs have also been
24 deprived of the life-long love, companionship, comfort, support, society, care, and
25 sustenance of DECEDENT, and will continue to be so deprived for the remainder of
26 their natural lives. Plaintiffs claim funeral and burial expenses and a loss of
27 financial support.
28

59. The shooting was excessive and unreasonable, especially because DECEDENT had not threatened to cause physical injury to defendants MURAD, RUIZ or any DOE DEPUTIES or any other person.

60. Defendants MURAD and RUIZ' shooting and use of force against the person of NOEL AGUILAR violated their training.

61. The conduct of Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES was willful, wanton, malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety of DECEDENT and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive damages as to individual Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES.

62. Plaintiffs N.L.A., and ELVIA AGUILAR bring this claim in each case as a successor-in-interest to DECEDENT, and in each case seek both survival and wrongful death damages for the violation of DECEDENT's rights.

63. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.

THIRD CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Unreasonable Search and Seizure—Denial of Medical Care (42 U.S.C. § 1983)

(Against Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES)

64. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 63 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

65. The denial of medical care by Defendants MURAZ, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES deprived DECEDENT of his right to be secure in his person against unreasonable searches and seizures as guaranteed to DECEDENT under the Fourth Amendment to the United States Constitution and applied to state actors by the Fourteenth Amendment.

66. As a result, DECEDENT suffered extreme pain and suffering and eventually suffered a loss of life and earning capacity. Plaintiffs have also been deprived of the life-long love, companionship, comfort, support, society, care, and

1 sustenance of DECEDENT, and will continue to be so deprived for the remainder of
2 their natural lives. Plaintiffs are also claiming funeral and burial expenses and a loss
3 of financial support.

4 67. Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES knew that failure to
5 provide timely medical treatment to DECEDENT could result in further significant
6 injury or the unnecessary and wanton infliction of pain, but disregarded that serious
7 medical need, causing DECEDENT great bodily harm and death.

8 68. The conduct of defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES was
9 willful, wanton, malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety
10 of DECEDENT and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary and punitive
11 damages as to Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES.

12 69. Plaintiffs Plaintiffs N.I.A. and ELVIA AGUILAR bring this claim in
13 each case as a successor-in-interest to DECEDENT, and in each case seek both
14 survival and wrongful death damages for the violation of DECEDENT's rights.

15 70. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.

16
17 **FOURTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

18 **Substantive Due Process (42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

19 (Against Defendants DOE DEPUTIES)

20 71. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1
21 through 70 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth
22 herein.

23 72. N.L.A. had a cognizable interest under the Due Process Clause of the
24 Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution to be free from state
25 actions that deprive her of life, liberty, or property in such a manner as to shock the
26 conscience, including but not limited to unwarranted state interference in Plaintiff's
27 familial relationship with her father, DECEDENT.

1 73. ELVIA AGUILAR had a cognizable interest under the Due Process
2 Clause of the Fourteenth Amendment of the United States Constitution to be free
3 from state actions that deprive her of life, liberty, or property in such a manner as to
4 shock the conscience, including but not limited to unwarranted state interference in
5 Plaintiff's familial relationship with her son, DECEDENT.

6 74. DECEDENT had a cognizable interest under the Due Process Clause of
7 the Fourteenth Amendment to the United States Constitution to be free from state
8 actions that deprive him of his right to life, liberty, or property in such a manner as
9 to shock the conscience.

10 75. The aforementioned actions of defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE
11 DEPUTIES, along with other undiscovered conduct, shock the conscience, in that
12 they acted with deliberate indifference to the constitutional rights of DECEDENT
13 and Plaintiffs, and with purpose to harm unrelated to any legitimate law
14 enforcement objective.

15 76. Defendants, MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES thus violated the
16 substantive due process rights of Plaintiffs to be free from unwarranted interference
17 with their familial relationship with DECEDENT.

18 77. As a direct and proximate cause of the acts of defendants MURAD,
19 RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES, DECEDENT experienced severe pain and suffering
20 and lost his life and earning capacity. Plaintiffs suffered extreme and severe mental
21 anguish and pain and have been injured in mind and body. Plaintiffs have also been
22 deprived of the life-long love, companionship, comfort, support, society, care, and
23 sustenance of DECEDENT, and will continue to be so deprived for the remainder of
24 their natural lives. Plaintiffs are also claiming funeral and burial expenses and a loss
25 of financial support.

26 78. The conduct of defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES was
27 willful, wanton, malicious, and done with reckless disregard for the rights and safety
28

1 of DECEDENT and Plaintiffs and therefore warrants the imposition of exemplary
2 and punitive damages as to Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES.

3 79. Plaintiffs N.L.A. and ELVIA AGUILAR bring this claim in each case
4 individually and as a successor-in-interest to DECEDENT, and in each case seek
5 both survival and wrongful death damages for the violation of DECEDENT's rights.

6 80. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.

7 8 **FIFTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

9 **Municipal Liability for Unconstitutional Custom or Policy (42 U.S.C. § 1983)**

10 (Against Defendants COUNTY and DOES 9-10)

11 81. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1
12 through 80 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth
13 herein.

14 82. At the time of the shooting of NOEL AGUILAR by defendants
15 ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ, defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES had
16 in place, and had ratified, policies, procedures, customs and practices of the
17 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES Sheriff's Department which permitted and
18 encouraged their Sheriff deputies and officials to unjustifiably, unreasonably violate
19 the constitutional rights to the public that reside in the low income communities of
20 the County of Los Angeles and in the South Central part of the County of Los
21 Angeles.

22 83. Specifically, the defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and its
23 Sheriff's Department, "LASD" has a history of criminal and violent gangs or
24 "cliques" forming among sheriff's deputies in the County jails and at sub-stations
25 throughout the County of Los Angeles. Those criminal and violent gangs that have
26 been exposed thus far include the "Little Devils," the "Vikings," the "Regulators,"
27 the "3000 Boys," the "2000 Boys," the "Jump Out Boys," and others. These
28 criminal and violent gangs self-identify through logos and tattoos. These criminal

1 and violent gangs, and a corresponding violent and criminal subculture, within
2 LASD has contributed to acts of excessive force, insubordination, and a "code of
3 silence" on patrol and in the jails for many years. Within these gangs, getting away
4 with the use of excessive and unreasonable force – including deadly force –
5 increases a deputy's status in the gang, as defined in California case law applying
6 Penal Code Section 186.22.

7 84. Problems associated with these deputy gangs have been known to the
8 defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES since at least 1992. The 1992 Kolts
9 Commission was created by the County after LASD shootings of unarmed citizens
10 provoked popular protests and demonstrations. The Board of Supervisors appointed
11 James G. Kolts, a highly respected retired superior court judge and former
12 prosecutor to investigate the allegations of pervasive incidence of excessive force
13 among LASD deputies. The subsequent report ("the Kolts Report") described
14 problems associated with the "Vikings" gang at the Lynwood Station that had
15 resulted in civil liability and an injunction. The Kolts Report described the
16 "Vikings" gang as comprised of "an inner group of deputies with peculiar and
17 unique hard attitudes" that "manifested themselves in the form of excessive force
18 and disciplinary problems between deputies and their supervisors." The Kolts
19 Report recommended that the LASD "identify, root out, and punish severely any
20 lingering gang-like behavior by its deputies," and that "unit commanders
21 aggressively break up deputy groups which manifest any of the conduct which
22 signifies gang-related activity." These sheriff gangs have expanded into the south
23 central Los Angeles area, including the specific location of the shooting in this case.

24 85. Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES knew or should have known
25 about the findings of the Kolts Report, including the above recommendations.
26 Plaintiff is informed and believes and thereupon alleges that notwithstanding these
27 recommendations, the defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES has ignored them
28 and instead have been deliberately indifferent to the continued growth of deputy

gangs in LASD, including at Century Station, Lynwood Station, Lancaster, and in particular the LASD "Gang Suppression Units", which is the unit that defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOES 4-10 belonged to at the time that NOEL AGUILAR was shot, as alleged herein.

86. Plaintiffs are informed and believe and thereon allege that on or before the date that NOEL AGUILAR was shot, the "Vikings" gang had merged with, had become known as, or had morphed into the "Regulators" and "Jump Out Boys" gangs that worked throughout the County under the Gang Suppression Unit, (also referred to the Gang Enforcement Team, "GET"). Deputies belonging to these criminal and violent sheriff gangs were and are encouraged to use excessive force, including deadly force, against citizens. The use of excessive force, including discharge of firearms and use of deadly force, was celebrated by the members of these deputy gangs. With respect to the "Regulators" "Vikings" and "Jump Out Boys" gangs, the use of excessive or unreasonable force by a deputy associated with the gang increases a member's status within the gang. The status of a gang member is doubly increased if the force involved is lethal, as well as if the gang member avoids civil or criminal liability for his or her unlawful conduct. This gang-clique deputy culture is tolerated and condoned by the station's leadership, including top leadership in the LOS ANGELES COUNTY SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT. In this case, Defendants MURAD and RUIZ and DOES 4-10 were associated with, were members of, were associates of, sympathized with, were influenced by, or adopted the principles of the "Regulators" and "Jump Out Boys" gangs.

87. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that prior to the shooting of decedent NOEL AGUILAR, in a speech delivered by former Undersheriff Paul Tanaka to the patrol deputies at Century Station and deputies of the Gang Suppression Unit, COUNTY deputies were encouraged to "function right to the edge of the line" and be very aggressive in using force against citizens. Plaintiff believes this amounted to direct encouragement of these aforementioned

1 deputy gangs, for whom the use of unconstitutional and excessive force is status
2 symbol. This speech facilitated the use of unreasonable and excessive force against
3 NOEL AGUILAR in this case.

4 88. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that on or
5 before the shooting of NOEL AGUILAR, defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES
6 also encouraged the patrol deputies at Century Station, and deputies of the Gang
7 Suppression Units (some of whom were or are members of gangs) to "operate in the
8 grey area." Plaintiff contends that this was understood as further encouragement and
9 support for the deputy gangs, and made more likely the use of unreasonable and
10 excessive force against NOEL AGUILAR in this case.

11 89. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that prior to the
12 shooting of NOEL AGUILAR, the Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES was
13 aware of problems of insubordination, excessive use of force, and an internal "code
14 of silence" among LASD deputies. The "code of silence," as it is colloquially
15 known, is the understanding among deputies that misconduct, corruption, crimes,
16 and the excessive use of force will not be reported through the chain of command.
17 The "code of silence" means that peace officers are expected to generate false
18 reports and perjure themselves to cover up the use of excessive force and other
19 misconduct by other officers. The "code of silence" encourages criminal and violent
20 gangs such as the "Vikings" and "Regulators" to commit insubordinate acts,
21 generate false reports, and use excessive or unreasonable force in an environment
22 which condoned, ratified and enabled deputy misconduct and use of excessive force.

23 90. On and before May 26, 2014, defendant COUNTY OF LOS
24 ANGELES was aware or should have been aware that they had a problem on their
25 hands. Some of the incidents leading up to this period include the following:

26 (a) A Ninth Circuit decision holding that Defendant Former Sherriff Lee
27 Baca could be held personally liable for unconstitutional practices in
28 Defendant COUNTY's jails;

1 (b) A series of civil rights settlements and verdicts adverse to Defendant
2 COUNTY;

3 (c) A series of public revelations of corruption, abuse and criminal conduct
4 by local and national news outlets;

5 (d) Investigations by Department of Justice, Department of Civil Rights
6 and the Federal Bureau of Investigation; and

7 (e) A series of public meetings at the County Board of Supervisors, at
8 which a motion was passed to form a Los Angeles County Citizens'
9 Commission on Jail Violence (hereinafter "ACCJV").

10 91. Plaintiffs are informed and believe, and thereon allege, that based on
11 the defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES' tolerance of rampant deputy
12 misconduct, as stated above, LASD deputies operate under a COUNTY OF LOS
13 ANGELES custom and practice of falsifying police reports of officer-involved
14 shootings, including the fabrication of claims that the victim was reaching for his
15 waistband or was aiming a weapon at them at the time of the shooting.

16 92. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices also called for the
17 defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and its Sheriff's Department not to
18 discipline, prosecute, or objectively and/or independently investigate or in any way
19 deal with or respond to known incidents, complaints, of wrongful shootings by
20 deputy sheriffs of the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT,
21 or the related claims and lawsuits made as a result of such shootings.

22 93. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices called for and lead to
23 the refusal of defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES to investigate complaints of
24 previous incidents of wrongful shootings and, instead, officially claim that such
25 incidents were justified and proper.

26 94. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices called for the refusal
27 of defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES to conduct executive meetings within
28 five days of such shootings to evaluate the shooting, prepare a plan to conceal any

1 misconduct committed during such incidents, and to plan and conduct a campaign to
2 conceal such misconduct.

3 95. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices called for COUNTY
4 OF LOS ANGELES, by means of inaction and coverup, to encourage its sheriff
5 deputies to believe that improper shooting of unarmed suspects, including members
6 of minority groups, was permissible. The concealment and cover up included
7 writing false police reports and testifying falsely as to how the excessive force
8 incident occurred.

9 96. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices of defendant
10 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES evidenced a deliberate indifference to the violations
11 of the constitutional rights of NOEL AGUILAR. This indifference was manifested
12 by the failure to change, correct, revoke, or rescind said policies, procedures,
13 customs and practices in light of prior knowledge by defendant COUNTY OF LOS
14 ANGELES of indistinguishably similar incidents of unjustified and unreasonable
15 Police shootings.

16 97. Said policies, procedures, customs and practices of defendant
17 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES evidenced a deliberate indifference to the violations
18 of the constitutional rights of NOEL AGUILAR. This indifference was manifested
19 by the failure to change, correct, revoke, or rescind said policies, procedures,
20 customs and practices, and tactic and weapons training in light of prior knowledge
21 by defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES of indistinguishably similar incidents.

22 98. Deliberate indifference to the civil rights of minority groups and other
23 victims of excessive force and Police officer-involved shootings was also evidenced
24 by defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES ignoring of the history and pattern of
25 prior civil lawsuits alleging civil rights violations and the related payment of
26 judgments to such individuals.

27 99. Deliberate indifference is also evidenced by maintenance of an
28 inadequate system of firearms discharges by the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES

1 SHERIFF'S DEPARTMENT which failed to identify instances of improper use of
2 firearms, as well as by the failure of by said defendant to adequately train and more
3 closely supervise or retrain deputies who in fact improperly used such weapons.

4 100. Other systemic deficiencies of COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES which
5 indicated, and continue to indicate, a deliberate indifference to the violations of the
6 civil rights by Sheriff's deputies of the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES include:

- 7 (a) preparation of investigative reports designed to vindicate the use of
8 firearms, regardless of whether such use was justified;
- 9 (b) preparation of investigative reports which uncritically rely solely on the
10 word of Sheriff deputies involved in the shooting incidents and which
11 systematically fail to credit testimony by non-deputy witnesses;
- 12 (c) preparation of investigative reports which omit factual information and
13 physical evidence which contradicts the accounts of the deputies involved;
- 14 (d) issuance of public statements exonerating deputies involved in such
15 incidents prior to the completion of investigations of the shootings;
- 16 (e). failure to objectively and independently review investigative reports by
17 responsible supervisors for accuracy or completeness and acceptance of
18 conclusions which are unwarranted by the evidence of the shooting or which
19 contradict such evidence; and,
- 20 (f) failure to maintain centralized department-wide system for the tracking
21 and monitoring of the use of excessive force, abuse of authority, and race-
22 based misconduct by individual Sheriff deputies so as to identify those
23 deputies who engage in a pattern of excessive force, abuse of authority, and
24 misconduct.

25 101. The foregoing acts, omissions, and systemic deficiencies are policies
26 and customs of defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES caused defendants
27 MURAD, RUIZ and DOES 3-10 to be unaware of the rules and laws governing
28 permissible use of firearms and to believe that firearms discharges are entirely

1 within the discretion of the deputy and that improper discharges would not be
2 objectively, thoroughly and properly investigated, all with the foreseeable result that
3 defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ would use deadly force in situations
4 where such force is neither necessary, reasonable nor legal, thereby violating the
5 civil rights of the citizens of this state.

6 102. As a result of the aforementioned acts, omissions, systematic
7 deficiencies, policies, procedures, customs and practices of defendant COUNTY OF
8 LOS ANGELES, Defendant deputy sheriffs ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ
9 wrongfully shot and killed NOEL AGUILAR, thereby causing the damages claimed
10 herein.

11 103. On information and belief, Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE
12 DEPUTIES' unjustified shooting of DECEDENT was found to be within LASD
13 policy.

14 104. On information and belief, Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE
15 DEPUTIES' unjustified shooting of DECEDENT was ratified by LASD
16 supervisorial officers.

17 105. On information and belief, Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE
18 DEPUTIES were not disciplined for the unjustified shooting DECEDENT.

19 106. On and for some time prior to May 26, 2014 (and continuing to the
20 present date), Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-10, acting
21 with gross negligence and with reckless and deliberate indifference to the rights and
22 liberties of the public in general, and of Plaintiffs and DECEDENT, and of persons
23 in their class, situation and comparable position in particular, knowingly maintained,
24 enforced and applied an official recognized custom, policy, and practice of:

- 25 (a) Employing and retaining as police officers and other personnel,
26 including defendants ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ DOE
27 DEPUTIES 3-8, whom Defendants COUNTY OF LOS
28 ANGELES and DOES 9-10 at all times material herein knew or

1 reasonably should have known had dangerous propensities for
2 abusing their authority and for mistreating citizens by failing to
3 follow written LASD policies, including the use of excessive
4 force;

5 (b) Of inadequately supervising, training, controlling, assigning, and
6 disciplining COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES sheriff's deputies
7 and other personnel, including defendants ALBERT MURAD,
8 JOSE RUIZ, DOE DEPUTIES 3-8, whom Defendants
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-10 knew or in the
10 exercise of reasonable care should have known had the
11 aforementioned propensities and character traits, including the
12 propensity for violence and the use of excessive force;

13 (c) By maintaining grossly inadequate procedures for reporting,
14 supervising, investigating, reviewing, disciplining and
15 controlling the intentional misconduct by Defendants MURAD,
16 RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES, who are sheriff's deputies and/or
17 agents of COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES;

18 (d) By failing to discipline COUNTY sheriff's deputies' and/or
19 agents' conduct, including but not limited to, unlawful detention
20 and excessive force;

21 (e) By ratifying the intentional misconduct of defendants MURAD,
22 RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES and other sheriff's deputies and/or
23 agents, who are sheriff's deputies and/or agents of COUNTY OF
24 LOS ANGELES;

25 (f) By having and maintaining an unconstitutional policy, custom,
26 and practice of detaining and arresting individuals without
27 probable cause or reasonable suspicion, and using excessive
28 force, including deadly force, which also is demonstrated by

1 inadequate training regarding these subjects. The policies,
2 customs, and practices of Defendants COUNTY OF LOS
3 ANGELES and DOES 9-10 were maintained with a deliberate
4 indifference to individuals' safety and rights; and

5 (g) By failing to properly investigate claims of unlawful detention
6 and excessive force by COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES sheriff's
7 deputies.

8 107. By reason of the aforementioned policies and practices of Defendants
9 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-10, DECEDENT was severely injured
10 and subjected to pain and suffering and lost his life.

11 108. Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-10, together
12 with various other officials, whether named or unnamed, had either actual or
13 constructive knowledge of the deficient policies, practices and customs alleged in
14 the paragraphs above. Despite having knowledge as stated above, these defendants
15 condoned, tolerated and through actions and inactions thereby ratified such policies.
16 Said defendants also acted with deliberate indifference to the foreseeable effects and
17 consequences of these policies with respect to the constitutional rights of
18 DECEDENT, Plaintiffs, and other individuals similarly situated.

19 109. By perpetrating, sanctioning, tolerating and ratifying the outrageous
20 conduct and other wrongful acts, Defendants DOES 9-10 acted with intentional,
21 reckless, and callous disregard for the life of DECEDENT and for DECEDENT's
22 and Plaintiffs' constitutional rights. Furthermore, the policies, practices, and
23 customs implemented, maintained, and still tolerated by Defendants COUNTY OF
24 LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-10 were affirmatively linked to and were a
25 significantly influential force behind the injuries of DECEDENT and Plaintiffs.

26 110. The actions of each of Defendants DOES 9-10 were willful, wanton,
27 oppressive, malicious, fraudulent, and extremely offensive and unconscionable to
28

1 any person of normal sensibilities, and therefore warrants the imposition of
2 exemplary and punitive damages as to Defendants DOES 9-10.

3 111. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants
4 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-10, Plaintiffs were caused to incur
5 funeral and related burial expenses, and loss of financial support.

6 112. By reason of the aforementioned acts and omissions of Defendants
7 COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-10, Plaintiffs have suffered loss of
8 love, companionship, affection, comfort, care, society, and future support.

9 113. Accordingly, Defendants COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES and DOES 9-
10 10 each are liable to Plaintiffs for compensatory damages under 42 U.S.C. § 1983.

11 114. Plaintiffs seek both wrongful death damages and survival damages
12 under this claim.

13 115. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.

14 **SIXTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF**

15 **False Arrest/False Imprisonment**

16 (Against All Defendants)

17 116. Plaintiffs repeat and re-allege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1
18 through 94 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth
19 herein.

20 117. Defendants ALBERT MURAD and JOSE RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES,
21 while working as sheriff's deputies for the LASD and acting within the course and
22 scope of their duties, intentionally deprived DECEDENT of his freedom of
23 movement by use of force, threats of force, menace, fraud, deceit, and unreasonable
24 duress. Defendants MURAD and RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES detained
25 DECEDENT without reasonable suspicion and arrested him without probable cause.

26 118. DECEDENT did not knowingly or voluntarily consent.

27 119. The conduct of defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES was
28 a substantial factor in causing the harm to DECEDENT.

120. Defendant COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES is vicariously liable for the wrongful acts of Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES pursuant to section 815.2(a) of the California Government Code, which provides that a public entity is liable for the injuries caused by its employees within the scope of the employment if the employee's act would subject him or her to liability.

121. The conduct of defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES was malicious, wanton, oppressive, and accomplished with a conscious disregard for the rights of DECEDENT, entitling Plaintiffs to an award of exemplary and punitive damages.

122. Plaintiffs N.L.A. and EL VIA AGUILAR bring this claim in each case as a successor-in-interest to DECEDENT, and in each case seek both survival and wrongful death damages for the violation of DECEDENT's rights.

123. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.

SEVENTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Battery (Cal. Govt. Code § 820 and California Common Law)

(Wrongful Death)

(Against All Defendants)

124. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 102 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

125. Defendants ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES, while working as sheriff's deputies for the LASD, and acting within the course and scope of their duties, intentionally shot DECEDENT multiple times. As a result of the actions of defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES, DECEDENT suffered severe pain and suffering and ultimately died from his injuries and also lost his earning capacity. Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES had no legal justification for using force against DECEDENT, and said Defendants' use of

1 force while carrying out their duties as sheriff's deputies was an unreasonable use of
2 force.

3 126. As a direct and proximate result of the conduct of defendants MURAD,
4 RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES as alleged above, Plaintiffs and DECEDENT suffered
5 extreme and severe mental anguish and pain and have been injured in mind and
6 body. Plaintiffs also have been deprived of the life-long love, companionship,
7 comfort, support, society, care and sustenance of DECEDENT, and will continue to
8 be so deprived for the remainder of their natural lives. Plaintiffs also are claiming
9 funeral and burial expenses and a loss of financial support.

10 127. Defendants DOES 9-10, inclusive, are directly liable and responsible
11 for the acts of Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE 3-8 because DOES 9-10,
12 inclusive, failed to adequately train, discipline, supervise, or in any other way
13 control Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES in the exercise of their
14 unlawful use of excessive and lethal force.

15 128. The COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES is vicariously liable for the
16 wrongful acts of Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOES 3-10 pursuant to section
17 815.2(a) of the California Government Code, which provides that a public entity is
18 liable for the injuries caused by its employees within the scope of the employment if
19 the employee's act would subject him or her to liability.

20 129. The conduct of defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE 3-10 was
21 malicious, wanton, oppressive, and accomplished with a conscious disregard for the
22 rights of Plaintiffs and DECEDENT, entitling Plaintiffs, in each case individually
23 and as a successor-in-interest to DECEDENT, to an award of exemplary and
24 punitive damages as to Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOES 3-10.

25 130. Plaintiffs N.L.A. and ELVIA AGUILAR bring this claim in each case
26 as a successor-in-interest to DECEDENT, and in each case seek both survival and
27 wrongful death damages for the violation of DECEDENT's rights.

28 131. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.

EIGHTH CLAIM FOR RELIEF

Negligence (Cal. Govt. Code § 820 and California Common Law)

(Wrongful Death)

(Against All Defendants)

132. Plaintiffs repeat and reallege each and every allegation in paragraphs 1 through 110 of this Complaint with the same force and effect as if fully set forth herein.

133. The actions and inactions of Defendants were negligent and reckless, including but not limited to:

- (a) the failure to properly and adequately assess the need to detain, arrest, and use force or deadly force against DECEDENT;
- (b) the negligent tactics and handling of the situation with DECEDENT, including pre-shooting negligence;
- (c) the negligent detention, arrest, and use of force, including deadly force, against DECEDENT;
- (d) the failure to provide prompt medical care to DECEDENT;
- (e) the failure to properly train and supervise employees, both professional and non-professional, including defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOE DEPUTIES;
- (f) the failure to ensure that adequate numbers of employees with appropriate education and training were available to meet the needs of and protect the rights of DECEDENT;

134. As a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct as alleged above, and other undiscovered negligent conduct, DECEDENT was caused to suffer severe pain and suffering and ultimately died and lost earning capacity. Also as a direct and proximate result of Defendants' conduct as alleged above, Plaintiffs suffered extreme and severe mental anguish and pain and have been injured in mind and body. Plaintiffs also have been deprived of the life-long love, companionship,

1 comfort, support, society, care and sustenance of DECEDENT, and will continue to
 2 be so deprived for the remainder of their natural lives. Plaintiffs also are claiming
 3 funeral and burial expenses and a loss of financial support.

4 135. The COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES is vicariously liable for the
 5 wrongful acts of Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOES 3-10 pursuant to section
 6 815.2(a) of the California Government Code, which provides that a public entity is
 7 liable for the injuries caused by its employees within the scope of the employment if
 8 the employee's act would subject him or her to liability.

9 136. The conduct of Defendants MURAD, RUIZ, and DOES 3-10 was
 10 malicious, wanton, oppressive, and accomplished with a conscious disregard for the
 11 rights of Plaintiffs and DECEDENT, entitling Plaintiffs, individually and as
 12 successors-in-interest to DECEDENT, to an award of exemplary and punitive
 13 damages as to individual Defendants MURAD, RUIZ and DOES 3-10.

14 137. Plaintiffs N.L.A. and EL VIA AGUILAR bring this claim in each case
 15 as successor-in-interest to the DECEDENT, and in each case seek both survival and
 16 wrongful death damages for the violation of DECEDENT's rights.

17 138. Plaintiffs also seek attorney fees under this claim.

18 19 20 **PRAYER FOR RELIEF**

21 WHEREFORE, Plaintiffs request entry of judgment in their favor and against
 22 Defendants the COUNTY OF LOS ANGELES, ALBERT MURAD, JOSE RUIZ,
 23 and Does 3-10, inclusive, as follows:

- 24 A. For compensatory damages, including both survival damages and
 25 wrongful death damages under federal and state law, in the
 26 amount to be proven at trial;
 27 B. For funeral and burial expenses, and loss of financial support;
 28

- 1 C. For punitive damages against the individual defendants in an
2 amount to be proven at trial;
3 D. For interest;
4 E. For reasonable costs of this suit and attorneys' fees; and
5 F. For such further other relief as the Court may deem just, proper,
6 and appropriate.
7

8 DATED: March 26, 2015

GUIZAR, HENDERSON & CARRAZCO,
L.L.P.

10 Bv _____/S/

11 Humberto M. Guizar
12 Attorneys for Plaintiffs

13
14 **DEMAND FOR JURY TRIAL**

15
16 Plaintiffs hereby demand a trial by jury.

17
18 DATED: March 26, 2015

GUIZAR, HENDERSON & CARRAZCO,
L.L.P.

19
20
21 Bv _____/S/

22 Humberto M. Guizar
23 Attorneys for Plaintiffs
24
25
26
27
28